



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/981,165	10/17/2001	Steve Dispensa	1585	7084

28004 7590 10/27/2005
SPRINT
6391 SPRINT PARKWAY
KSOPHT0101-Z2100
OVERLAND PARK, KS 66251-2100

EXAMINER

PATEL, ASHOKKUMAR B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 10/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/981,165	Applicant(s) DISPENSA ET AL.	
	Examiner Ashok B. Patel	Art Unit 2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 August 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-24 are subject to examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. Rejections of claims 9 and 17 are withdrawn based on the amendments to these claims.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 08/17/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons:

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102:

Applicant's argument:

"Hansen does not mention a separate performance management system communicating with each of the analyzing consoles 202, 204. the network analyzing agents 214. and the MIB 420."

In other words, no apparatus of Hansen sends instructions for RMON information to, and then receives RMON information from, each of an RMON probe, an RMON manager configured to access the RMON probe. and an RMON database configured to be accessed by the RMON manager. as provided for in amended claims 1, 9 and 17."


Examiner's response:

Applicant has correctly interpreted as "the Office Action equating the network analyzing agent 214 with the RMON probe referred to in claim 1, the remote distributed-network analyzing console 204 with the RMON manager and the RMON database referred to in claim 1, and the distributed-network analyzing console 202 with the

Art Unit: 2154

performance management system claimed in claim 1. As a result, the Office action indicates that the operation of the distributed-network management monitoring system 200 of Fig. 2 anticipates the method of claim 1."

As depicted in Fig. 2 and explained below the "distributed-network analyzing console 202" is a separate performance management system communicating with each of the analyzing consoles 204.



Hansen indicates in col. 5, line 65 through col. 6, line 3, "Network interface 312 is used by network analyzing console 300 to communicate with the various agents on the network. Network analyzing console 300 may be either a local-network analyzing console 108, a distributed-network analyzing console 202, or remote distributed-network analyzing console 204."

Also, in col. 5, line 30-32, Hansen indicates "Distributed-network analyzing console 202 formats and displays the data in a format that can be easily manipulated and acted upon."

Thus, the "distributed-network analyzing console 202" is a separate performance management system communicating with each of the analyzing consoles 204. and the network depicted in Fig. 2 is an apparatus of Hansen sending instructions for RMON information to, and then receiving RMON information from, each of an RMON probe, an RMON manager configured to access the RMON probe. and an RMON database configured to be accessed by the RMON manager. as provided for in amended claims 1, 9 and 17."

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Applicant's argument:

"However, like Hansen, Abdelnour does not teach or suggest a performance management system as reference in claim 1, 9 and 17a which is a separate entity from an RMON manager. Thus, neither Hansen, nor Abdelnour, nor any combination there of teach or suggest the subject matter of claims 1, 9 and 17."

Examiner's response:

Art Unit: 2154

Abdelnour teaches performance management system wherein the RMON information comprises a number of users (col. 13, line 31 : statistics includes Active stations).

Applicant's argument:

"No mention is made of remote monitors other than in the background section of Fletcher. Thus, Fletcher does not teach or suggest a performance management system &s described in claims 1, 9 and 17."

Examiner's response:

Fletcher teaches a performance management system computing download speed from network and application layer information along with time stamps to determine file transfer or download speed (col. 15, lines 34-40: correlating packets using protocol layer information, col. 16, lines 45-55: calculating download speed and bytes/unit time). These teachings are in the context of, as Fletcher put it, "Accordingly, a need exists for a method to monitor a computer system communication network that readily and quickly detects and identifies a degradation of the network." That is why these teachings are of a paramount importance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-4, 9-12 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hansen (US 6, 697,871 B1).

Referring to claim 1,

Hansen teaches a method of operating a performance management system (Fig.2), the method comprising:

generating and transmitting a first instruction for a Remote Monitoring (RMON) probe to request RMON information', (Fig.2, "network Analyzing Agent 1.) receiving and storing the RMON information in memory in the performance management system (col. 5, line 15-32, line 66 through col. 6, line 3);

generating and transmitting a second instruction for an RMON manager configured to access the RMON probe to request the RMON information; (Fig. 2, element 204, col. 5, line 15-32, line 66 through col. 6, line 3)

receiving and storing the RMON information in the memory in the performance management system; (Fig. 2, element 204, col. 5, line 15-32, line 66 through col. 6, line 3)

generating and transmitting a third instruction for an RMON database configured to be accessed by the RMON manager to request the RMON information; (Fig. 2, element 204, col. 5, line 15-32, line 66 through col. 6, line 3) and

receiving and storing the RMON information in memory in the performance management system. (Fig. 2, element 202, col. 5, line 15-32)

Referring to claim 2,

Art Unit: 2154

Hansen teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the RMON information comprises datalink layer information. (col . 7, line 34-42).

Referring to claim 3,

Hansen teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the RMON information comprises application layer information. (col. 7, line 34-42).

Referring to claim 4,

Hansen teaches the method of claim 1 wherein the RMON information is based on a media access control address. (col. 7, line 34-42).

Referring to claim 9,

Claim 9 is a claim to software product on a software storage medium storing instructions to carry out the method of claim 1 . Therefore claim 9 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 1 .

Referring to claim 10,

Claim 10 is a claim to s6ftware product on a software storage medium storing instructions to carry out the method of claim 2. Therefore claim 10 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 2.

Referring to claim 11,

Claim 11 is a claim to software product on a software storage medium storing instructions to carry out the method of claim 3. Therefore claim 11 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 3.

Referring to claim 12,

Claim 12 is a claim to software product on a software storage medium storing

Art Unit: 2154

instructions to carry out the method of claim 4. Therefore claim 12 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 4.

Referring to claim 17,

Claim 17 is a claim to Remote monitoring management system adapted to carry out the Method of claim 1. Therefore claim 17 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 1 .

Referring to claim 18,

Claim 18 is a claim to Remote monitoring management system adapted to carry out the method of claim 2. Therefore claim 18 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 2.

Referring to claim 19,

Claim 19 is a claim to Remote monitoring management system adapted to carry out the method of claim 3. Therefore claim 19 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 3.

Referring to claim 20,

Claim 20 is a claim to Remote monitoring management system adapted to carry out the method of claim 4. Therefore claim 20 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 4.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2154

7. Claims 5, 13 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen (US 6, 697,871 B1) in view of Abdelnour et al. (hereinafter Abdelnour)(US 6,112,241).

Referring to claim 5,

Hansen fails to explicitly teach the method of claim 1 wherein the RMON information comprises a number of users.

Abdelnour teaches performance management system wherein the RMON information comprises a number of users (col. 13, line 31 : statistics includes Active stations).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Hansen and Abdelnour because they both gather statistics on network performance using RMON probes. Furthermore, the teaching of Abdelnour to modify the performance management system taught by Hansen to collect number of users information would provide for more informed network management by providing a more complete picture of network behavior (col. 5, line 50-53).

Referring to claim 13,

Claim 13 is a claim to software product on a software storage medium storing instructions to carry out the method of claim 5. Therefore claim 13 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 5.

Referring to claim 21,

Claim 21 is a claim to Remote monitoring management system adapted to carry out the method of claim 5. Therefore claim 21 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 5.

Art Unit: 2154

8. Claims 6-8, 14-16 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen (US 6, 697,871 B1) in view of Fletcher et al. (hereinafter Fletcher) (US 6,363,477)

Referring to claims 6, 7 and 8,

Hansen fails to explicitly teach the method of claim 1 wherein the RMON information comprises a number of bytes transmitted, and wherein the RMON information comprises download speed, and wherein the RMON information comprises bits per second.

Fletcher teaches a performance management system computing download speed from network and application layer information along with time stamps to determine file transfer or download speed (col. 15, lines 34-40: correlating packets using protocol layer information, col. 16, lines 45-55: calculating download speed and bytes/unit time).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Hansen and Fletcher because they both gather statistics on network performance Furthermore, the teaching of Fletcher to modify the performance management system taught by Hansen to collect additional information such as download speed, number of bytes transmitted and such information would provide for more informed network management by providing a more complete picture of network behavior (col. 5, line 50-53).

Referring to claims 14, 15 and 16,

Claims 14, 15 and 16 are claims to software product on a software storage medium

Art Unit: 2154

storing instructions to carry out the method of claims 6, 7 and 8. Therefore claims 14, 15 and 16 are rejected for the reasons set forth for claims 6, 7 and 8.

Referring to claims 22, 23 and 24,

Claims 22, 23 and 24 are claims to Remote monitoring management system adapted to carry out the method of claims 6, 7 and 8. Therefore claims 22, 23 and 24 are rejected for the reasons set forth for claims 6, 7 and 8.

Conclusion

Examiner's note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant.

Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the ad and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2154


extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ashok B. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3972. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Abp

 JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISOR
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100